IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER

THURSDAY, THE 21ST JUNE 2007 / 31ST JYAISHTA 1929

RP.No. 575 of 2007(Y)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.16380/2007

.....

PETITIONERS (NOT PARTIES IN WRIT PETITION)

---

1. K.C.INDIRA DEVI,
   MEDICAL RECORDS LIBRARIAN GRADE I,
   MEDICAL COLLEGE HOSPITAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. D.AJAYALAL,
   MEDICAL RECORDS LIBRARIAN GRADE I,
   OPHTHALMIC HOSPITAL, MEDICAL COLLEGE,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.T.R.RAVI

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONER & RESPONDENTS

---

1. SMT. P.P.KARTHU, AGED 54 YEARS,
   W/O. M.K.VISWAM, MALANI HOUSE, THRISSUR DISTRICT.

2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
   THE SECRETARY TO HEALTH AND FAMILY DEPARTMENT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL EDUCATION,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER
SRI.P.K.ASHOKAN
SRI.M.R.VENUGOPAL
SMT.DHANYA P.ASHOKAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 21/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

A.K. Basheer, J.

- -

RP. 575/2007 in W.P(C) No. 16380/2007

- -

Dated this the 21st day of June, 2007.

ORDER

Having heard learned counsel for the review petitioner, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and the learned Government Pleader and having perused the materials placed on record, I do not find any ground to review the judgment.

2. However I hasten to add that the judgment was rendered in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, particularly for the reason that it was brought to my notice that petitioner was about to retire on superannuation on June 30, 2007.

3. The primary contention raised by the review petitioner is that Ext.P4 was not at all published. But it is belied by Annexure II order itself. Moreover, Annexure A2 seniority list was made available for my perusal before the judgment was dictated (It was published on May 26, 2007). It was brought to my notice that the position of writ petitioner in the seniority list had gone up considerably. She was placed at serial No.2. The fact that there were 5 vacancies was also taken note of. It was in the above circumstances that I had directed the Department to pass an appropriate order. It was made clear that it would be open to the authority concerned to pass an appropriate "provisional order" also.

4. If the review petitioner is still aggrieved, she has to pursue other remedies. Her contentions cannot be considered in a review petition, which by its scope and ambit admits of only very narrow dimension.

Review Petition is closed.

A.K. Basheer

Judge.

an.